

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to clarify the invention. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 7 of the application as originally filed.

Claims 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph.

Claims 27-30 have been amended for the sake of clarification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-19 and 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcott (US 6,324,273) in view of Majmudar et al. (US 4,897,866).

Neither Alcott nor Majmudar, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests, at least "placing a call to the first party to inform the first party that the first telecommunication feature has become available, wherein placing the call to inform the first party that the first telecommunication feature has become available occurs before the first party has subscribed to the first telecommunication feature."

The Office Action correctly states that Alcott does not teach informing the first party that the first telecommunication feature has become available, wherein the informing occurs in response to the upgrading the portion of the communication network and the processing of the first data structure and the availability data. The Office Action is incorrect that Majmudar fills the gaps left by Alcott. To combine Alcott and Majmudar, the Office Action interprets the term 'selects' to be 'inquire'. It is clear, however, from the context of the Majmudar reference, that the term 'selects' does not mean to 'inquire' as claimed, but rather to 'subscribe'. Moreover, the claims recite 'inquiring' about a telecommunication feature 'unavailable' to the party. The selected feature in Majmudar is clearly 'available' to the party. Further, even if Majmudar could be read to disclose displaying a requested new feature to inform the party in response to the upgrading the portion of the communication network, neither reference, alone or in combination, disclosed such informing by placing a call 'to' the first party. In

addition, the claims have been amended to recite that "placing the call to inform the first party that the first telecommunication feature has become available occurs before the first party has subscribed to the first telecommunication feature." For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4224 if there are any outstanding issues that could be resolved through a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Vincent J. Gnoffo
Registration No. 44,714
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611
(312) 321-4200